

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The priority papers were filed with the original application papers and their receipt was acknowledged in the above-mentioned Examiner's Action. The undersigned hereby reiterates the priority claim made in the earlier-filed Declaration.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to define the invention more particularly. As shown in FIGS. 3a and 3b, amended claim 1 now describes a drive for reciprocating a roll stand 2 of a pilger cold-rolling system, the drive comprising:

- a crank shaft 13 defining an axis transverse to a reciprocation direction of the stand 2;

- a crank-shaft gear 9 fixed on the crank shaft 13;

- a crank 5 on the crank shaft 13 and rotatable therewith about the axis;

- a tie rod 7' having an outer end journaled on the stand 2 and an inner end eccentrically journaled on the crank 5, whereby rotation of the crank shaft 13 reciprocates the stand 2 in the direction;

a compensating weight 6 fixed eccentrically to the crank 5 opposite the tie rod 7' and orbiting in a weight plane 26 substantially perpendicular to the axis on rotation of the crank 5;

a single counterweight shaft 12 offset along the plane 26 from the crank shaft 13 and substantially parallel thereto;

a counterweight gear 10 fixed on the counterweight shaft 12;

a single counterweight 8 fixed eccentrically on the counterweight shaft 12 and offset along the weight plane 26 from the crank 5, one of the weights 6 or 8 being integrally formed with the respective gear 9 or 10; and

drive means 14, 11 connected to the counterweight shaft 12 for rotating same and for thereby synchronously orbiting the counterweight 8 and the compensating weight 6 in the weight plane 26.


The main reference against this case, US 5,224,369 of Rebag, is substantially different. More particularly, US '369 shows a system with multiple counterweights, not the "single" one defined in amended claim 1. Furthermore, here both the counterweights and the compensating weights are separate items, not formed as parts of the respective gears. This is a clear-cut structural difference that is nowhere suggested in US '369 or in the other cited and applied reference, US 5,540,076 of Baensch.

New independent claim 14 differs from amended claim 1 only in that it recites that both the compensating weight 6 and the counterweight 8 form parts of the respective gears 9 and 10. Once again this is nowhere suggested in the art.

Thus the amended and new claims clearly describe an invention that is structurally different from what is seen in the art. Thus all of the claims are clearly in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

06 December 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: None